UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,765	11/19/2001	Manfred Bartz	CYPR-CD01194M	2082

45545 7590 09/26/2008

CYPRESS C/O MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/989,765	BARTZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 July 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed 07/07/2008.

Claims 1-24 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, and 30 have been amended. Claims 1, 6, and 17 are independent claims.

Request Continuation for Examination

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed 07/07/2008 has been entered.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the recited "*medium*" of Claim 21. The Specification does

not mention the recited "*medium*." Thus, there is no support or antecedent basis for the recited "*medium*" that allows the meaning of the term to be ascertained, as required in 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

a. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24, and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anderson et al.** (US 6282551) in view of **Rajarajan et al.** (US 6950990) and further in view of **Cypress MicroSystems**, "Cypress MicroSystems Unveils Programable System-On-A-Chip For Embedded Internet" 11/2000, pp. 1-3.

As to claim 1:

Anderson teaches a method for facilitating the display of information of an electronic document for a selected pre-configured function, the method comprising:

- scanning for indicators within the electronic document, the indicators are hidden from a user *[See Col. 8, lines 33-67: scrolling different parts of a large spreadsheet … "flip through" several pages of the notebook to rapidly locate information of interest … permits access to identifiers for pages which are not currently visible on the screen device 106. If a desired identifier or tab is not currently in view, the user simply activates the tab scroller 271 to reveal additional tabs],* wherein each of the indicators is for indicating a predetermined location within the electronic document *[See Col. 8, lines 3 -24: the user associates the page identifiers with familiar tabs from an ordinary paper notebook. Thus, the user already knows how to select a page or spread of interest: simply select the tab corresponding to the page (as one would do when selecting a page from a paper notebook)];*

- in response to the scanning, automatically rendering a graphic element for each corresponding indicator *(e.g., individual notebook pages are identified by page identifiers 260, preferably located along one edge of*

the notebook 250 … each page identifier is in the form of a tab member (e.g., members 261a, 262a, 263a) situated along a bottom edge of the notebook. Each tab member may include representative indicia, such as textual or graphic labels, including user-selected titles representing the contents of a corresponding page … simply select the tab corresponding to the page; col.8, lines 3-67, col.9, lines 35-56 and see also figs. 2C-E), wherein the graphic element is rendered with a descriptive label according to information with the indicator *[See Col. 8, lines 3 -23: Each tab member may include representative indicia, such as textual or graphic labels, including user-selected titles representing the contents of a corresponding page … tab members are typically given descriptive names provided by the user … user associates the page identifiers with familiar tabs from an ordinary paper notebook. Thus, the user already knows how to select a page or spread of interest: simply select the tab corresponding to the page];* and

- in response to a graphic element being selected, scrolling to a predetermined location within the electronic document corresponding to the selected graphic element and displaying information of the predetermined location [See C*ol. 8, lines 33-67; see also figs. 3A-C: movement 'i.e., location of desired information cells' within a spreadsheet notebook… to move to different pages in the notebook, the user simply selects the*

corresponding tab from tabs 260. To move to Page B, for example, the user selects tab 262a; similarly, Page C is reached by selecting tab 263a … the user may return to Page A by selecting tab 261a. Thus instead of finding information by scrolling different parts of a large spreadsheet, or by invoking multiple windows of a conventional three-dimensional spreadsheet, the present invention allows the user to simply and conveniently "flip through" several pages of the notebook to rapidly locate information of interest].

Anderson, however, does not specifically teach "corresponding to the selected graphic element, moving a scroll box to a location of a scroll bar that indicates a current location within the electronic document, the scroll bar and the scroll box for scrolling through the electronic document."

Rajarajan teaches corresponding to the selected graphic element, moving a scroll box to a location of a scroll bar that indicates a current location within the document, the scroll bar and the scroll box for scrolling through the document [See C*ol. 28, line 11- Col. 30, line 57: a GUI-type visual presentation to convey information to and receive commands from users for controlling or accessing one or more of the resources 306 … a variety of GUI elements or objects, including windows, icons, text, drop-down menus, dialog boxes, toolbars, buttons, controls, and the like … allows a user to select from among a number*

of predefined consoles. That is, the user may use the console selection element 1222 to access a number of different "console layouts" … include graphical control elements that are appropriate for various scenarios or tasks. Alternatively, consoles may be authored to include graphical control elements that are specific to a specific user's job functions or administrative level].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anderson with Rajarajan because it would have provided the capability for customizing output information for a particular client computer system, allowing the use of many different types of client computer systems (e.g., laptops, desktops, PDAs, cell phones, etc), and communicating with the client computer system to provide the proper format and amount of output information, as well as input information.

The combination of Anderson with Rajarajan does not specifically teach "receiving the selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises the plurality of programmable system blocks."

Cypress teaches receiving the selected pre-configured function that is based on a plurality of programmable system blocks, wherein a microcontroller comprises

the plurality of programmable system blocks [S*ee page 1: Cypress Microsystems engineers selected a variety of digital and analog peripherals, then created PSoC blocks, or system-on-a-chip blocks … configure the PSoC blocks on the PSoC device accordingly].*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Cypress with Anderson as modified by Rajarajan because it would allowed customers to select the function they need and automatically integrate the necessary PSoC blocks into their PSoC device.

As to claim 2:

The combination of Anderson and Rajarajan does not specifically teach "the plurality of programmable system blocks comprises a matrix of interconnected analog blocks*."*

Cypress teaches the plurality of programmable system blocks comprises a matrix of interconnected analog blocks [S*ee page 1: [A]nalog PSoC blocks are 8-bit peripherals that can be programmed to perform a variety of functions … They can connected in series to handle more complex functions].*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Cypress with Anderson as modified by Rajarajan because it would have provided the capability for customers to select the function they need and automatically integrate the necessary PSoC blocks into their PSoC device.

As to claim 3:

Anderson teaches the document is a datasheet providing technical details of the pre-configured function [*col.8, lines 3 -32: move to different pages in the notebook, the user simply selects the corresponding tab from tabs 260. To move to Page B, for example, the user selects (e.g., with keyboard 104 or pointing device 105) tab 262a; similarly, Page C is reached by selecting tab 263a. Continuing the example, the user may return to Page A by selecting tab 261a. Thus instead of finding information by scrolling different parts of a large spreadsheet … the present invention allows the user to simply and conveniently "flip through" several pages of the notebook to rapidly locate information of interest].*

As to claim 4:

Anderson does not specifically teach an HTML document.

Rajarajan teaches an HTML document *(e.g., an HTML document) [See the discussion beginning at col.28, line 3].*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rajarajan with Anderson because it would have provided the capability for performing scenario-based tasks requiring interaction with multiple resources while providing a uniform user interface for each of the multiple resources.

As to claim 6:

Anderson does not specifically teach "*an XML document*."

Rajarajan teaches an XML document *(e.g., an XML document) [See col.35, lines 43-64].*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rajarajan with Anderson because it would have provided the capability for performing scenario-based tasks requiring interaction with multiple resources while providing a uniform user interface for each of the multiple resources.

As to claim 7:

Anderson teaches the document is selected from a catalog of documents *(See col.2, lines 13-65).*

As to claim 8:

Rajarajan teaches the user module is selected from a catalog of user modules *[see col. 9, lines 49-63 and see also fig.3: the user interface manager 326 allows for the use of many different types of client computer system].*

As to claim 9:

Anderson teaches the graphic elements are rendered adjacent to the document [S*ee Col. 7, line 45- Col. 8, line 32].*

As to claim 10:

Anderson teaches an interaction with the scroll bar activates a graphic element upon passing a corresponding indicator of the graphic element, such that a current location on the document is rendered [S*ee Col. 8, lines 32-67 and see figs. 3A-C].*

As to claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Anderson teaches a bus *(e.g., a system bus 110)*; a display device *(e.g., a*

display device 106); a memory *(e.g., a main memory 102)*; and a processor *(e.g., a central processor 101) [See col.5, lines 21-31 & also see fig.1]*.

As to claims 12-14 and 16-20:

Refer to claims 2-4 and 6-10 above, respectively, for rejections.

As to claims 21-24 and 26-30:

Refer to claims 2-4 and 6-10 above. Claims 21-24 and 26-30 are the same as claims 2-4 and 6-10, except claims 21-24 and 26-30 are computer-usable medium claims and claims 2-4 and 6-10 are method claims.

b. Claims 5, 15, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anderson et al.** in view of **Rajarajan et al,** and **Cypress MicroSystems** as applied to Claims 1, 11, and 21 above, and further in view of **Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).**

As to claims 5, 15, and 25:

The combination of Anderson, Rajarajan, and Cypress MicroSystems does not specifically teach the indicators are embedded HTML anchors.

AAPA discloses the indicators are embedded HTML anchors [See page 2: HTML and XML, providing for supplying embedded anchors through an electronic document].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine AAPA with Anderson as modified by Rajarajan and Cypress MicroSystems because it would have provided the capability for rapidly accessing and processing information on the different pages, as well as displaying a plurality of page identifiers for selecting individual pages.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicants' arguments filed 07/07/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent Claims 1, 11, and 21:

Applicant argues in substance that Anderson does not teach scanning for indicators within the electronic document, the indicators are hidden from a user [Remarks, Page 9].

The examiner disagrees.

Anderson does teach scanning (e.g., *scrolling)* for indicators (e.g. *identifiers)* within the electronic document (e.g., *pages)*, the indicators are hidden from a user (*identifiers for pages which are not currently visible on the screen device) [See Col. 8, lines 33-67].*

Regarding dependent Claims 5, 15, and 25:

Applicant argues that Anderson does not teach the indicators are embedded HTML anchors [Remarks, Page 10].

In response, the examiner agrees. However, AAPA is now used to teach "the indicators are embedded HTML anchors" (see the rejection above).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Contact information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Maikhanh Nguyen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100